DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 587 CE 033 301

TITLE Youth Unemployment in the Summer of '82. A Survey of 125 Cities.
INSTITUTION United States Conference of Mayors, Washington, D. C.
PUB DATE 26 Apr 82
NOTE 31p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Career Education; Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; Minority Groups; National Surveys; Program Effectiveness; *Unemployment; Urban Areas; *Urban Youth; *Youth Employment; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Summer Youth Employment Program

ABSTRACT

A survey of major United States cities assessed the severity of youth unemployment problems and effects that cuts in the Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) will have on those problems. Information was received from 125 cities (72%). Three of four cities reported overall youth unemployment rates of 11-30%. Minority youth unemployment rates were higher than the overall rates, averaging almost 40%. Ninety-one percent of the cities reported that SYEP allocations for the summer were below those received the previous one. Almost 90% of the cities planned to serve fewer youth. Eighty-six percent of the cities did not anticipate any other public funds to compensate for SYEP losses. Cities estimated that over half of all eligible youths would remain unserved in summer 1982. Two of three cities indicated youth served will experience effects of funding cuts. Over half of all cities feared increased youth crime as a result of SYEP reductions. One-fourth of local officials believed that summer unemployment problems would increase the number of school dropouts. Over 80% of the cities believed proposals to shift program responsibility to the state level would produce adverse effects. (A list of the survey cities and the survey are appended.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED219587

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE SUMMER OF '82

A Survey of 125 Cities

April 26, 1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John J. Gunther

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

United States
Conference of Mayors

CE033301

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	3
WHAT ARE THE YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT RATES IN CITIES?	6
WHAT ARE THE SUMMER YOUTH FUNDING REDUCTIONS FOR FY82?	8
WHAT ARE THE SUMMER YOUTH SERVICE REDUCTIONS FOR FY82?	9
WILL CITIES COMPENSATE FOR FY82 CUTS IN SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAMS?	11
HOW MANY ELIGIBLE YOUTHS WILL REMAIN UNSERVED IN THE SUMMER OF 1982?	12
WILL EFFECTS OF FUNDING REDUCTIONS BE FELT BY YOUTHS SERVED IN THE SUMMER PROGRAM?	14
WHAT ARE THE ANTICIPATED EFFECTS OF SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAM CUTS ON CITIES?	15
WHAT ARE THE POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF A SHIFT TO STATE RESPONSIBILITY FOR LOCAL EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS?	19
APPENDICES	21
I. LIST OF 125 SURVEY CITIES	
II. SURVEY INSTRUMENT	
III. UNEMPLOYMENT DATA FROM CITIES	

SUMMARY

In response to a request from the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, the U. S. Conference of Mayors surveyed major cities across the country to assemble a picture of (1) the severity of youth unemployment problems in the cities and (2) the effects that cuts in the government's Summer Youth Employment Program will have on those problems. One hundred and twenty-five cities (72 percent of all cities surveyed) responded with information on their youth unemployment and summer program situations.

- Three out of four of the 125 survey cities reported overall youth unemployment rates in the 11-30 percent range. Only five of the cities believe their youth unemployment is below 10 percent, whereas 16 of the cities report a rate above 30 percent. For the 125 cities, the average overall youth jobless rate was reported to be almost 23 percent.

- The minority youth unemployment rates reported by the survey cities were much higher than the overall rates. Three out of four survey cities put these rates in the 21-60 percent range, with the average for all cities reporting at almost 40 percent.

- Ninety-one percent of the survey cities reported that SYEP allocations for this summer are below those received last summer. Two out of three of the cities are experiencing reductions that are 11-20 percent below last year; 10 cities have been reduced between 30 and 37 percent.

- Almost 90 percent of the survey cities plan to serve fewer youth this year than last. These cities report that about 53,400 fewer eligible youth will participate this summer because of the funding reductions.

- Eighty-six percent of the survey cities do not anticipate that any other sources of public funds will be available to them this summer to compensate for the SYEP allocation losses they have experienced; 55 percent do not believe that any private sources of funds, jobs or services will be available either.

- A substantial portion of the youths eligible for the SYEP in the summer of 1982 will go unserved, according to the sample cities. On average, the survey cities estimate that well over half of all of their eligible youth will remain unserved after all resources have been exhausted. In 110 of the sample cities, over 1.35 million youth are expected to go unserved.

- Two out of three of the survey cities indicated that the youth who are served in this summer's program will feel the effects of funding cuts in the form of fewer working hours and reduced services.

- Over half of all survey cities fear that youth crime, in one form or another, will increase as a result of the SYEP reductions and overall conditions this summer. According to many officials, this summer will see fewer youth served, fewer youth employed, and more youth on the streets with nothing to do.

- One-fourth of the local officials participating in the survey believe that summer youth employment problems will produce an increased number of school dropouts, in that more youth will have to stay out of school to seek work for family income, and more will lack the money they need to return to school in the fall.

- Over 80 percent of the survey cities believe that proposals to shift responsibility for local employment and training programs to the state level -- proposals now being examined by Congress -- will, if implemented, produce adverse effects for youth employment programs. Loss of local control and failure of states to meet locally-identified needs were among the reasons given for concern.

INTRODUCTION

The Nation's unemployment rate in March, 1982, reached nine percent, matching the post-World War II record set in 1975. Nearly 10 million American workers were unemployed in March and a record 1.3 million were considered too discouraged to look for work and so are not included in the unemployment count.

The government's March unemployment report puts joblessness among all teenagers at about 22 percent. For black and other teenagers, 16-19 years of age, the count is substantially higher: over 42 percent, seasonally adjusted.

Many sources project a continued increase in unemployment in the months ahead. Youth unemployment is expected to rise as we approach the summer of 1982. More young people will be out of school, competing with unemployed adults for jobs, both full time and part time.

In the face of serious youth unemployment, the Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP), the Nation's primary vehicle for providing young people access to summer jobs, has been reduced by the Administration in FY82 and proposed for elimination in FY83.

Last summer the U.S. Department of Labor allocated almost $799 million for the program; this summer, the allocation is about $685 million, including more than $32 million in funds carried over from the previous fiscal year. This is a reduction of more than 14 percent. If the carry-in of last year's funds is not included, it is a reduction of over 18 percent.

The Summer Youth Employment Program, one of the "social safety net" programs, started in 1979 as an outgrowth of the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The purpose of SYEP is to provide disadvantaged youth, ages 14-21, with job opportunities and basic education and training. In response to criticism of the program several years ago by the General Accounting Office, a special monitoring effort by federal auditors and independent accountants has since demonstrated that the program has been cost-effective while providing quality work experience for young people.

Members of Congress and the mayors of America's prinicipal cities share a concern that unemployment which is high in the overall labor force, and higher in the cities, and higher still among young people, and highest among minority youth -- that this unemployment situation will create serious problems in our cities during the summer of 1982. To add to the problem, increasing needs for youth employment assistance are being met by decreasing resources to meet those needs.

The survey of youth unemployment in cities described in this document was requested by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress and is an attempt by the U.S. Conference of Mayors to develop a more complete picture of the youth employment problems likely to emerge this summer.

Survey Approach

On April 15, 1982, mailgrams requesting specific information on youth unemployment problems and effects of Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) budget cuts for FY82 were sent to 173 cities -- all cities which had been direct recipients (individually or as members of consortia) of federal SYEP funds. The mailgram requested that local officials responsible for administration of employment and training programs phone their responses to the survey questions to U.S. Conference of Mayors staff members by April 20. At close of business on April 20, the bulk of information requested had been provided, or was being assembled, by 125 cities.

The following table illustrates the geographic distribution, by U.S. Department of Labor Region, of cities receiving the survey and cities responding to it.

DOL REGION	NUMBER OF CITIES RECEIVING SURVEY	NUMBER OF CITIES RESPONDING TO SURVEY
I	15	12
II	19	13
III	17	14
IV	29	19
V	31	24
VI	16	10
VII	11	11
VIII	4	2
IX	26	17
X	5	3
	173	125

The response rate for the survey varied among regions from a low of 50 percent to a high of 100 percent. The overall response rate was 72 percent.

Eight basic questions were contained in the survey:

1. What is the overall and minortiy youth unemployment rate in your city, and how many discouraged youth are not included in those rates?

2. Is your SYEP allocation for the summer of 1982 more or less than last year, and what is the amount of the difference?

3. How many youth will you serve this summer in your program, and how does this compare to last year's service level?

4. Will your city be able to make up for SYEP funding decreases by using other sources of either public or private resources?

5. How many eligible youths in your city will go unserved by your summer youth program?

6. Will youths who <u>are</u> served by your summer program also be affected by the SYEP funding reductions?

7. Will the decreases in SYEP funding have an adverse effect on your city, and if so, in what ways?

8. If responsibility for local employment and training programs was shifted to the state level (as is now being considered in Congress), how would your youth employment programs be affected?

The responses of the 125 cities to these questions are described in the following eight sections of this report.

Appendix I to this document lists the 125 cities which responded to the survey. Appendix II contains the questions which comprised the survey.

WHAT ARE THE YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT RATES IN CITIES?

Estimates of youth unemployment rates provided by the survey cities illustrate both the severity of the problem nationwide and the wide range that exists in youth unemployment levels from one city to another across the country.

In terms of overall youth unemployment, only five of the 125 cities reported youth unemployment rates below 10 percent. Tulsa reported the survey low of four percent. For the majority of cities, youth unemployment falls into a range between 11 and 30 percent. Ninety-five cities -- three out of four survey cities -- reported unemployment rates in this range. Fourteen cities put their overall youth unemployment rate at 25 percent; this was the most frequently cited figure.

The average rate for all survey cities was about 23 percent. Highest overall rates were reported by Hartford (52 percent) and Youngstown (60 percent).

Survey cities reported minority youth unemployment rates that were much higher than those reported for all youth. For minorities, three out of four survey cities fell into a range between 21 and 60 percent unemployed. For the cities that submitted data, the average minority youth rate was about 40 percent. Lincoln reported the survey low of eight percent. The highest estimates were reported by Montgomery (79 percent), Youngstown (80 percent), Riverside (83 percent), and Gary (88 percent). The following table illustrates the levels of unemployment for all youth and for minority youth as reported by the survey cities.

	Number of Cities Reporting	
Unemployment Percentage	Overall Youth Unemployment	Minority Youth Unemployment
1-10	5	2
11-20	51	9
21-30	45	22
31-40	9	35
41-50	5	24
51-60	2	13
61-70		4
71-80		3
81-90		2
Don't Know	8	11
	125	125

To complete the picture of youth unemployment problems, survey cities were asked for estimates of the numbers of "discouraged" youths -- those who have given up looking for work and so are not included in unemployment counts. Eighty-four of the survey cities offered estimates of the number

of these discouraged youth. Thirteen local officials estimated that less than 1,000 discouraged youth would be found in their cities. Cities reporting the smallest numbers (under 500) were Ann Arbor, Madison, Warren, Independence, Cambridge, Topeka, and Syracuse.

Most cities (48) estimated that discouraged youth numbered between 1,000 and 5,000. Of the remaining 23 cities, 12 said that between 5,000 and 10,000 discouraged youth could be identified; 10 estimated that discouraged youth numbered between 10,000 and 21,000; one city -- New York -- believes that 100,000 discouraged youth can be found. Cities estimating more than 10,000 discouraged youth -- in addition to New York -- include Birmingham, Cleveland, Fresno, Lexington, Mobile, Nashville, Seattle, Wichita, and Fort Lauderdale.

Overall youth and minority youth unemployment rates and discouraged youth estimates submitted by survey cities are contained in Appendix III.

WHAT ARE THE SUMMER YOUTH FUNDING REDUCTIONS FOR FY82?

Of the 125 cities participating in this survey, 114 (91 percent) have received Summer Youth Employment Program allocations for this summer that are below those received last summer. For some cities, the allocations are far below last year's. Portland heads this list with an allocation 37 percent lower than a year earlier. Santa Ana and Warren have received 35 percent less money, Grand Rapids 34 percent less, and Riverside 33 percent less. Others posting reductions of 30 percent or more are Lincoln, Fall River, Pittsburgh, Cambridge, Seattle, Augusta, and Anaheim.

As shown in the following table, some allocation cuts were 10 percent and lower. The smallest percentage cuts were reported by Hammond (3 percent) and the Lehigh-Allentown Consortium and Little Rock (4 percent).

Percentage Cut in Funds FY81-FY82	Number of Cities Reporting	Percentage of Cities Reporting
1-10	15	12
11-20	81	65
21-30	8	6
31-40	10	8
Same as Last Year	5	4
No Response	5	4
Increase	1	1
	125	100

Most reductions -- about two out of three -- fall into a range between 11 and 20 percent. Five of the survey cities reported funding levels largely unchanged from last Summer: Lexington, Macon, Omaha, and Rochester. One city, Denver, reported a slight (two percent) increase over last summer.

For the 119 survey cities reporting either a cut or no change, the total SYEP allocation for FY82 is $206.5 million. This represents a reduction of nearly $41 million, or 16.5 percent, from the FY81 level.

WHAT ARE THE SUMMER YOUTH SERVICE REDUCTIONS FOR FY82?

Because of the reductions in the allocations for the Summer Youth Employment Program in FY82, survey cities plan to serve an estimated 53,474 fewer eligible youths than last year. One hundred and twelve of the survey cities (almost 90 percent of the total) plan service reductions this summer. The following table lists the sizes of the service reductions that are anticipated by the cities.

Service Reduction Level 1981	Number of Cities Reporting	Percentage of Cities Reporting
100 and less	28	25
101-200	27	24
201-300	16	14
301-500	12	11
501-700	12	11
701-1,000	8	7
1,001-3,000	5	4
3,001-5,000	2	2
5,001 and above	1	1
Don't Know	1	1
	112	100

As illustrated, about half of the cities will reduce youth service levels by more than 200 participants; eight of the cities will serve more than 1,000 fewer young people. This list is headed by New York, which plans a service reduction of 5,750, followed by Baltimore with a planned reduction of 5,000. Others lowering service levels by more than 1,000 include Augusta, Chicago, Detroit, and Seattle.

In terms of percentage reductions below last year's service levels, Ann Arbor heads the list with an expected 75 percent drop, followed by Hammond with 62 percent fewer youth served this year. Other cities expecting to serve over 30 percent fewer youth than last year include Akron, Augusta, Baltimore, Baton Rouge, Berkeley, Fall River, Fort Wayne, Independence, Lincoln, Portland, Providence, Richmond (CA), Riverside, Seattle, Spokane, Syracuse, Tulsa, Waterbury, Wichita, Yonkers, and Youngstown.

The following table lists the percentage reductions in youths to be served as reported by the survey cities.

PERCENT FEWER YOUTH SERVED 1981-1982	NUMBER OF CITIES REPORTING	PERCENTAGE OF CITIES REPORTING
1-10	13	12
11-20	45	40
21-20	25	22
31-40	18	16
41-50	9	8
51 and above	2	2
	112	100

As illustrated, about half of the cities will reduce service levels by 20 percent or less; about half will reduce them by more than 20 percent. Ten cities estimated that they would serve approximately the same number of youths as last year. They include Cedar Rapids, Denver, Hartford, Indianapolis, Montgomery, Rochester, Santa Ana, and Toledo. Three felt they would be able to provide additional services in the summer of 1982. Hampton, Trenton, and Harrisburg together expect to serve 250 additional youths.

WILL CITIES COMPENSATE FOR FY82 CUTS IN SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAMS?

On the basis of the survey results it is clear that local government officials are not anticipating that other public revenues will be available to help make up for the decreases in Summer Youth Employment Program allocations. An overwhelming 108 cities, or 86 percent of those surveyed, did not anticipate any other public funding to supplement their present allocation. Only 16 cities, or 13 percent, identified other public funding sources which could be tapped. Six of these cities -- Wichita, Cincinnati, Kansas City (MO), Rochester, Savannah and two mid-western cities -- expect to use local funds. In Wichita the "local tax base will be used to create about 200 jobs, at a cost of $350,000." Another four cities (St. Paul, Canton, Cedar Rapids and Elizabeth) have identified state funds from sources such as the governor's youth or summer employment programs, or the department of community affairs. Two cities anticipate using Community Development Block Grant funds; four more (Cedar Rapids, Cleveland, Des Moines and Kansas City, MO) expect to use other funds from the Department of Labor.

Expectations were somewhat higher in regard to private sector assistance this summer. While 69 cities (55 percent) did not expect to be able to identify any private funds, jobs or services, 50 cities (40 percent) did expect to do so. Of these, 23 indicated that private funds could be tapped, 36 identified private jobs that might be available, and five felt they might be able to obtain private services, such as job banks.

- o Baltimore indicated that it had received a $250,000 contribution from the private sector and has also identified 700 jobs in the private sector.

- o Cedar Rapids indicated that a $30,000 grant from Ralston Purina to a local community action agency sub-contractor would provide 30 jobs, and that 500 youths will be employed by several local firms.

- o Madison cited private corporation grants of $12,000 and $2,500.

- o A number of cities, including Albuquerque and Cedar Rapids, indicated jobs would be available through a "dial-a-teen" type of program.

- o Tulsa is hoping for 100 private sector jobs, and is asking local businesses to "buy" public service projects.

- o Pittsburgh, the Lehigh-Allentown Consortium, and Cedar Rapids anticipate that some jobs will be provided through their Private Industry Councils.

- o Cleveland, Columbus (OH), Des Moines, and Akron are working with the National Alliance of Business.

Few cities could identify additional ways to supplement their SYEP funding; of the 125 cities, only 11 (less than 9 percent) could do so. Of these, four indicated that they will seek help from community-based organizations and agencies.

HOW MANY ELIGIBLE YOUTH WILL REMAIN UNSERVED IN THE SUMMER OF 1982?

The 125 survey cities reported that a substantial portion of the youths eligible for the Summer Youth Employment Program in 1982 will go unserved, even when all anticipated public and private summer employment efforts are implemented. When officials were asked to estimate the percentage of all eligible youths in their cities likely to remain unserved this summer, their responses ranged from Santa Ana's low estimate of two percent to Little Rock's high of 95 percent. On average, the survey cities indicated that 53 percent of their eligible youth would remain unserved.

On the basis of data provided by 110 survey cities, almost 1,355,000 eligible youth will remain unserved in these cities. This number looms large in comparison to the estimated 232,000 that will be served this summer in these cities: for every one eligible youth served, therefore, about five will not be served.

Among the relatively few cities estimating a modest shortfall (10 percent or less) are Topeka, Phoenix, Springfield (MO), Raleigh, and Cedar Rapids. Thirty-four cities estimate service shortfalls of 71 percent and above. They are the following:

Albany	Grand Rapids	Newark
Augusta	Hampton	Orange County (CA)
Baltimore	Jackson	Pittsburgh
Baton Rouge	Kansas City (KS)	Portsmouth
Berkeley	Lansing	Richmond (CA)
Cambridge	Lehigh-Allentown	Riverside
Cleveland	Little Rock	St. Paul
Dayton	Milwaukee	Tulsa
Des Moines	Mobile	Youngstown
Glendale		

The following table illustrates the levels of service shortfalls anticipated, expressed as percentages of unserved eligible youth, reported by the survey cities.

Percentage of Unserved Youth	Number of Cities Reporting	Percentage of Cities Reporting
1-10	9	7.2
11-20	7	5.6
21-30	9	7.2
31-40	12	9.6
41-50	11	8.8
51-60	8	6.4
61-70	8	6.4
71-80	13	10.4
81-90	17	13.6
91-100	4	3.2
Don't Know	19	15.2
No Response	8	6.4
	125	100.0

WILL EFFECTS OF FUNDING REDUCTIONS BE FELT BY YOUTHS SERVED IN THE SUMMER PROGRAM?

Cuts in funding for the Summer Youth Employment Program limit the Program in two distinct ways. First, the cuts limit the number of young people that can be served. Second, they limit the program experience for those who are served.

According to the responses received from officials in 86 survey cities -- more than two out of three of all survey cities -- the youths who will be served by SYEP this summer will feel the effects of the allocation cuts.

The survey instrument suggested three general ways in which SYEP participants could be affected by cuts. The following table indicates the number of survey cities that anticipate program modifications in these three areas.

Response Category	Number of Cities
Fewer Working Hours	61
Reduced Employment Services	36
Reduced Supportive Services	45

Several cities indicated that they would be reducing program activities such as career exploration, reducing staff, and investing less in supplies and tools.

Thirty-eight of the survey cities did not believe that the youth served in their programs this summer would be adversely affected by the allocation cuts. For many program administrators during the summer of 1982, a classic trade-off between quantity and quality will be made.

WHAT ARE THE ANTICIPATED EFFECTS OF SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAM CUTS ON CITIES?

City officials contacted in this survey were asked to assess the effects of the summer youth program decreases on their cities. A scale of five responses, ranging from "very serious adverse effect" to "no adverse effect" was provided. Only one of the 125 cities participating in the survey did not respond to this item. The responses of all cities are summarized in the following table.

Response Category	Cities	Percentage of Cities
Very Serious Adverse Effect	37	29.5
Serious Adverse Effect	47	37.5
Moderate Adverse Effect	27	21.5
Little Adverse Effect	12	9.5
No Adverse Effect	1	1
Don't Know	1	1
	125	100

Exactly two out of three of all cities in the survey indicated that the decrease in their summer youth program would have serious or very serious adverse effects.

Anticipating very serious adverse effects are the following:

Albany	Little Rock	Riverside
Ann Arbor	Long Beach	St. Paul
Baltimore	Mobile	Savannah
Chicago	New Orleans	Seattle
Durham	New York	Springfield (MA)
Elizabeth	Newark	Springfield (MO)
Ft. Lauderdale	Phoenix	Syracuse
Fresno	Pittsburgh	Warren
Grand Rapids	Portsmouth	Waterbury
Kansas City (MO)	Richmond	Youngstown
Lehigh-Allentown		

(Six city responses confidential)

Anticipating little adverse effect are Austin, Canton, Cleveland, Colorado Springs, Columbus (OH), Denver, Greensboro, Honolulu, Montgomery, Omaha, Rochester, and Toledo. Several of the "little adverse effect" reports were qualified, however. While both Cleveland and Rochester believe they can hold the line on youth programs this summer, the future is unsure. Cleveland anticipates that the "unemployment rate will...be skyrocketing next summer." Greensboro's assessment of little adverse effect is based on

what they consider to be "only a modest reduction of funds," and Toledo recognizes that they "will have to watch the pennies a little closer."

A Canton official expressed a view that has been reported to the Conference of Mayors by many employment specialists over the past several months. He indicated that Canton's participation level would be lower this summer, but suggested that little additional adverse effect would be experienced because the problem of youth unemployment is already so bad. A spokesman for Detroit reported only a moderate adverse effect "because the number of unemployed is high anyway." Explaining the moderate assessment, he asked: "How much worse can things get?"

In some cases, cities report that negative effects of allocation cuts can be held to the moderate level because they have had time to plan for the cuts. Trenton, the only city that anticipates no adverse effect, has converted administrative funds to program service funds in order to absorb the effect of the FY82 allocation decrease.

Problems Anticipated in the Summer of '82

At the conclusion of the survey, local officials were asked to describe in their own words any specific problems they anticipated in their cities this summer as a result of reductions in federal funding for summer youth programs. Six of the total 125 cities did not know what to anticipate or made no response to this query. Another eight cities did not anticipate problems, in some cases because of relatively small program decreases or low unemployment rates locally.

All of the remaining cities had something to say about the effects of the program cuts on their youth and on their communities. Among these cities, crime was the problem most often mentioned.

Over half of all cities participating in the survey expressed the fear that youth crime, in one form or another, would increase in the summer as a result of the cutbacks in summer youth employment. In cities from coast to coast, in all regions of the country, officials speak of increased youth crime, of delinquency, of vandalism, of gang activity. And the reason that they offer is in most cases the same, and is simply this: This summer there will be fewer youth served in employment programs, fewer youth employed, and more youth on the street with nothing to do. An official in Detroit expressed it this way: "Any time you have a large number of youths on the streets you can expect increased criminal activity and civil unrest. This is not an imflamatory statement, but with a reduced police force, the problem could get worse -- all hell could break loose."

In Phoenix there is fear that "summer heat, gangs and unemployment could lead to an explosive situation by August," but few cities raised the potential for large-scale violence during the summer of 1982 in direct terms. Instead, officials used terms such as social unrest, danger of confrontation, general restlessness, increased street activity, and increased interracial hostility. Syracuse refers to the "potential for problems (of) discontent," and Wichita observes that a lot of youth want something to do "and would hate to project what that could turn into." An

official in Akron "doesn't want the imagination to run wild, but past experience suggests that an increase in social unrest is likely." Akron, and Waterbury and a few other cities noted that it is the combination of youth employment program cuts and cuts in other service programs that will lead to problems. A spokesman for the City of Buffalo said that "CETA cuts, when combined with other cuts not CETA-related, make a situation that could cause trouble."

The employment and training staff in Grand Rapids has held meetings with the police department and the board of education to express their concern with possible disruptions in the City this summer. With reductions in public park staff, they are concerned with securing park facilities so that people can use them. It is "really very edgy around here," according to one Grand Rapids official.

Some cities simply do not know what to expect during the summer of 1982. Canton has experienced a large increase in teenage unemployment over the past several years and says the potential problem is "hard to gauge." A Canton spokesman said that in the past they have not experienced severe problems, "but (we) have never had 6,100 youths out of work before...(The) City could be in for a new experience." Cleveland does not foresee specific problems but does not know what to expect because "the numbers (of unemployed youth) are increasing every year."

Almost one in four of the cities contacted in the survey expect summer youth employment problems to produce more school dropouts and contribute to long term employment problems. In most of these cases, officials believe that the need for money will force young people out of school to look for work, and that the lack of money this summer will discourage them from returning to school in the fall.

This is a time of high overall unemployment -- youth and adult -- in the cities. Disadvantaged families especially need money from all sources to meet their basic needs. In Lehigh-Allentown and other cities across the country, the Summer Youth Employment Program has contributed to family earnings through the wages of the youth employed through the program. But the program reductions are reducing this flow of money to families in need. The resulting financial pressure on the families, officials believe, will keep disadvantaged youth out of school, looking for any source of income. A spokesman for Spokane explained: "Lots of summer kids are now the primary wage earners in their families. They are not earning discretionary money. Kids applying are now saying 'My dad is out of work -- we need food.' This is different than past years -- more serious implications for families."

Baltimore anticipates "severe hardships for youth dependent upon (summer) income to support families and to provide funds for school."

Lack of money to prepare for a return to school is the second part of the problem for disadvantaged youth. Young people often use the money earned in the Summer Youth Employment Program to buy clothes and materials to return to school in the fall. Without this money, in many cases, they are not expected to return. In Savannah it is expected that "many will be too embarrassed to return to school." A New Jersey city spokesman reports that their school dropout rate "is certain to increase because of lack of

money for youth to buy school clothes and materials." The same is true in Youngstown, according to officials there.

Shreveport believes that the key is to keep young people in school, and that long term goals are frustrated by cutbacks in the programs that contribute to school attendance. Des Moines foresees young people not returning to school this year, embarking upon the "long term unemployment syndrome."

Officials in many cities indicated that when youth cannot participate in a Summer Youth Employment Program, they lose much more than just earnings. Officials point to loss of work experience, labor market orientation, motivation, good work attitudes, productive time, earning power, and self worth. In describing the effects of summer program cutbacks on youth, they use words like frustration, discouragement, dissatisfaction, and disenchantment. Some see increased likelihood of drug and alcohol abuse, domestic problems, mental and physical problems. Some anticipate that higher welfare costs, social service costs and law enforcement costs will result. Several cities offered examples of how the loss of summer youth workers would translate into the loss of services to others in the city.

- o New York anticipates reductions in community and recreation services, day care and summer camps for children of working parents.
- o Shreveport will provide lower levels of social services such as transportation for handicapped persons.
- o Buffalo expects that fewer people will be served by the public agencies normally staffed by summer youth workers.
- o Camden says that the level of service to community-based organizations and neighborhood groups will be lower.

Some cities report that municipal services will be reduced, that streets and parks will not be as clean.

In cities across the country, national economic problems dictate that fewer jobs exist this summer than last. In most cities, more young people need employment help, but fewer will receive it. Cities like Chicago recognize that summer program cuts aggravate an already bad situation.

In Greensboro, officials believe "There will be problems if there is no demonstration of care or concern for youth this summer."

In Nashville they say simply "Things will not be good."

And the frustration of one city official was expressed this way: "This was supposed to be one of the untouchable seven safety net programs...what's happening here is a damn shame."

WHAT ARE THE POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF A SHIFT TO STATE RESPONSIBILITY FOR LOCAL EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS?

Because proposals to shift responsibility for administration of local employment and training programs to the states are circulating at this time in Congress, local officials were queried concerning the effect of such a shift on their youth employment program.

A high percentage of survey cities expressed concern with the notion of greater state responsibility for the programs. One hundred and three (82 percent) of the 125 sample cities indicated that a shift to state administration would produce an adverse effect on youth employment programs. Twelve cities (about 10 percent) believe a shift would have relatively little effect. Only one city, Winston-Salem, felt there would be a positive effect, but no reasons were given for this.

Few positive comments were made regarding a shift to state responsibility. One New England city indicated it was already working with the state on its jobs programs. Stockton felt its program would be designed locally even under state administration. Patterson thought that the key factor was the availability of funds, not who administered the program. Only four large cities felt that their size or economic conditions assured that they would continue to receive funds: Kansas City (KS), Toledo, Cleveland, and Columbus (OH).

The majority of the reasons given for concern about a shift to state responsibility were expressed in negative terms. The most frequently cited concerns were the loss of local control, flexibility, or expertise, and the inability of state programs to respond to locally-identified needs. Thirty-nine cities anticipated problems in these areas.

- o Baton Rouge indicated that cities have experience with, and are more aware of the needs of, local people.
- o Phoenix said that cities are more familiar with local unemployment situations.
- o Waterbury sees a need for "local hands on the pulse," and believes that with local control, there "would be fewer obstacles for youth."
- o Wilmington fears a "loss of local control and of local accountability by political officials.
- o Lincoln said the shift would "remove local control and separate the dollars from the problems."
- o Berkeley cited "a loss of history, of credibility, and of expertise resulting from the shift."

Greater administrative costs and burdens were also frequently cited as concerns emanating from a shift to greater state responsibility for programs. Thirty cities raised issues in this area. Fifteen cities, Fort Lauderdale among them, fear greater administrative costs, resulting in less

funds for programs; fourteen cities, including Savannah and Buffalo, fear the creation of another layer of bureaucracy.

Alexandria, Lansing, and Lowell mentioned more administrative headaches or red tape for cities; Brockton, Rochester, and New Orleans mentioned funding delays; a lack of program uniformity was cited by Durham.

Other concerns associated with increased state responsibility for programs included the following.

- o Increased competition among urban, suburban, and rural areas in a state. Five large cities felt they would lose funds to smaller cities and rural areas; five smaller cities thought the reverse could occur.

- o The lack of state capability to implement an employment and training program. Nineteen cities identified the absence of a state system; eleven cited lack of state competence to handle a program.

- o The interjection of politics into the system. Ten cities cited this potential problem. One city said "politics would screw things up." Two cities were concerned because their political affiliation differed from that of the state government.

- o A shift in program emphasis from youths to other target populations, primarily adults. Ten cities share this fear. Several cities with high unemployment believe program competition between skilled adults and unskilled youth could result. St. Louis foresees skilled adults competing with kids, and kids not getting a reasonable share of the program funds.

APPENDIX I: LIST OF 125 SURVEY CITIES

1. Akron, Ohio
2. Albany, New York
3. Albuquerque, New Mexico
4. Alexandria, Virginia
5. Amarillo, Texas
6. Anaheim, California
7. Ann Arbor, Michigan
8. Atlanta, Georgia
9. Augusta, Georgia
10. Austin, Texas
11. Baltimore, Maryland
12. Baton Rouge, Louisiana
13. Berkeley, California
14. Birmingham, Alabama
15. Bridgeport, Connecticut
16. Brockton, Massachusetts
17. Buffalo, New York
18. Cambridge, Massachusetts
19. Camden City, New Jersey
20. Canton, Ohio
21. Cedar Rapids, Iowa
22. Chicago, Illinois
23. Cincinnati, Ohio
24. Cleveland, Ohio
25. Colorado Springs, Colorado
26. Columbus, Georgia
27. Columbus, Ohio
28. Corpus Christi, Texas
29. Dallas, Texas
30. Dayton, Ohio
31. Denver, Colorado
32. Des Moines, Iowa
33. Detroit, Michigan
34. Durham, North Carolina
35. Elizabeth, New Jersey
36. Erie, Pennsylvania
37. Fall River, Massachusetts
38. Fort Lauderdale, Florida
39. Fort Wayne, Indiana
40. Fresno, California
41. Gary, Indiana
42. Glendale, California
43. Grand Rapids, Michigan
44. Greensboro, North Carolina
45. Hammond, Indiana
46. Hampton, Virginia
47. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
48. Hartford, Connecticut
49. Hoboken, New Jersey
50. Honolulu, Hawaii
51. Huntsville, Alabama
52. Independence, Missouri
53. Indianapolis, Indiana
54. Jackson, Mississippi
55. Jersey City, New Jersey
56. Kansas City, Kansas
57. Kansas City, Missouri
58. Lansing, Michigan
59. Las Vegas, Nevada
60. Lehigh-Allentown, Pennsylvania
61. Lexington, Kentucky
62. Lincoln, Nebraska
63. Little Rock, Arkansas
64. Long Beach, California
65. Louisville, Kentucky
66. Lowell, Massachusetts
67. Macon, Georgia
68. Madison, Wisconsin
69. Milwaukee, Wisconsin
70. Minneapolis, Minnesota
71. Mobile, Alabama
72. Montgomery, Alabama
73. Nashville, Tennessee
74. Newark, New Jersey
75. New Bedford, Massachusetts
76. New Orleans, Louisiana
77. New York City, New York
78. Norfolk, Virginia
79. Omaha, Nebrask
80. Orange County, California
81. Patterson, New Jersey
82. Phoenix, Arizona
83. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
84. Pittsfield, Massachusetts
85. Portland, Oregon
86. Portsmouth, Virginia
87. Providence, Rhode Island
88. Raleigh, North Carolina
89. Richmond, California
90. Richmond, Virginia
91. Riverside, California
92. Roanoke, Virginia
93. Rochester, New York
94. Rockford, Illinois
95. St. Louis, Missouri
96. St. Paul, Minnesota
97. San Bernadino, California
98. San Diego,California

99. San Francisco, California
100. Santa Ana, California
101. Santa Clara County, California
102. Savannah, Georgia
103. Scranton, Pennsylvania
104. Seattle, Washington
105. Shreveport, Louisiana
106. Spokane, Washington
107. Springfield, Massachusetts
108. Springfield, Missouri
109. Stamford, Connecticut
110. Stockton, California
111. Syracuse, New York
112. Tampa, Florida
113. Toledo, Ohio
114. Topeka, Kansas
115. Trenton, New Jersey
116. Tulsa, Oklahoma
117. Warren, Michigan
118. Washington, D.C.
119. Waterbury, Connecticut
120. Wichita, Kansas
121. Wilmington, Delaware
122. Winston-Salem, North Carolina
123. Worcester, Massachusetts
124. Yonkers, New York
125. Youngstown, Ohio

APPENDIX II: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

URGENT...PLEASE RESPOND IMMEDIATELY.

Congressman Henry S. Reuss, Chairman of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, has an immediate need for information on the status of this summer's youth employment programs in cities. Chairman Reuss has asked the Conference of Mayors for summer youth employment data from 100 cities for use in legislative and appropriations deliberations.

We need your help to respond to this important request. Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions, most of which can be answered with a checkmark. Then PHONE your answers to us AS SOON AS POSSIBLE and by 12:00 noon on TUESDAY, APRIL 20 at the latest.

1a. What would you say is the overall rate of youth unemployment in your city?

_____%

1b. What is the overall rate of minority youth unemployment in your city?

_____%

1c. What would you estimate is the total number of "discouraged youth" no longer looking for work and so not included in the unemployment rate?

_____(number)

2a. What is your allocation of federal funds for your FY82 summer youth employment program?

$_____

2b. If you have not yet received your allocation, what is your planning estimate for this summer's program?

$_____

2c. Is this amount more, about the same, or less than last summer?

(1) ___ Greater than last summer
(2) ___ About the same as last summer
(3) ___ Less than last summer

2d. By how much? $_____ and _____% (increase or decrease)

3a. How many target youth (disadvantaged, 14-21 years of age) do you expect to serve in your FY82 summer youth program?

_____Number of Persons

3b. How does this number compare with the number you served last summer?

(1)____Greater than last summer
(2)____About the same as last summer
(3)____Smaller than last summer

3c. By your estimate, how many more or fewer persons will you serve this summer compared to last summer?

____(Number of persons) and _____% (increase or decrease)

4. Now we need to know if you think your city can make up for any decrease in federal funding for its summer youth program in other ways.

4a. Do you think you will be able to get other public funds to supplement the present allocation?

(1)____YES
(2)____NO

4b. If "yes," what other public funds?

(1)____Local funds (Please specify)

(2)____State funds (Please specify)

(3)____Other federal funds (Please specify)

4c. Please check any of the following private sector sources of assistance you think you can tap.

(1)____Private funds (Please specify)

(2)____Private jobs (Please specify)

(3)____Private services, such as job banks (Please specify)

4d. Are there any other ways you can think of that you will be able to supplement your FY82 summer youth funding? (Please specify)

5a. Proposals to shift responsibility for employment and training to the states are being circulated at this time. If such a shift were to occur, how do you think youth employment programs would be affected?

(1)____Adverse effect

(2)____Relatively little effect

(3)____Positive effect

5b. Briefly, why?

6. Taking into account all public and private summer employment efforts anticipated for your city, how many, if any, eligible youths (disadvantaged, 14-21 years old) will go unserved?

_____Number and ____% of total unemployed youths in city

7a. Will those youths who are served this summer by your program be adversely affected by FY82 funding reductions, or not?

(1)____Yes

(2)____No

7b. If "yes," how?

(1)____Fewer working hours

(2)____Reduced employment services

(3)____Reduced supportive services

(4)____Other (please specify)

8a. In general, how would you say that the decreases in the summer youth program will affect your city?

(1)____Very serious adverse effect

(2)____Serious adverse effect

(3)____Moderate adverse effect

(4)____Little adverse effect

(5)____No adverse effect

8b. Please describe what, if any, specific problems you foresee in your city this summer as the result of reductions in federal funding for summer youth?

Again, when you have finished your questionnaire, please call us as soon as possible. If unable to reach the person receiving calls for your region, choose any other name. If you would like any part of any answers held in confidence, please let us know when you phone.

APPENDIX III: UNEMPLOYMENT DATA

City	Overall Rate of Youth Unemployment	Overall Rate of Minority Youth Unemployment	Number of Discouraged Youth
Akron	26	50	5,500
Albany	20	55	1,200
Albuquerque	21	28	1,100
Alexandria	14	21	--
Amarillo	--	--	--
Anaheim	25	60	--
Ann Arbor	12	28	300
Augusta	16	23	1,200
Austin	20	10	--
Baltimore	40	56	4,000
Baton Rouge	24	38	3,000
Berkeley	19	48	--
Birmingham	23	31	15,000
Brockton	23	42	--
Cambridge	13	30	500
Camden	41	48	2,000
Canton	22	50	2,000
Cedar Rapids	12	--	2,500
Chicago	24	53	--
Cleveland	40	55	20,000
Colorado Springs	23	27	--
Columbus (GA)	--	--	--
Columbus (OH)	17	37	1,025
Corpus Christi	--	--	--
Dayton	16	32	--
Denver	14	27	2,250
Des Moines	16	36	5,000
Detroit	33	67	4,000
Durham	30	45	7,500
Elizabeth	25	36	2,600
Erie	26	32	3,500
Fall River	17	28	700
Fort Lauderdale	13	50	21,000
Fort Wayne	28	42	850
Fresno	24	28	15,000
Gary	45	88	4,000
Glendale	10	40	--
Grand Rapids	45	62	4,000
Greensboro	20	35	1,500
Hammond	35	45	--
Hampton	17	38	1,000
Harrisburg	11	20	7,000
Hartford	40	40	2,500
Huntsville	30	38	--
Independence	18	45	421

Indianapolis	23	39	--
Jackson	15	29	--
Jersey City	20	75	50
Kansas City (KS)	20+	--	--
Kansas City (MO)	30	45	1,500
Lansing	25	39	1,000
Las Vegas	9	32	--
Lehigh-Allentown Consortium	22	38	2,750
Lexington	26	31	10,635
Lincoln	8	8	800
Little Rock	14	26	1,000
Long Beach	15	45	800
Lowell	14	20	--
Macon	--	--	--
Madison	19	45	300
Milwaukee	--	--	--
Mobile	24	42	17,500
Montgomery	43	79	--
Nashville	18	29	9,000
Newark	25	30	1,556
New Bedford	20	30	4,000
New Orleans	40	50	6,000
New York City	28	50	100,000
Omaha	30	55	--
Orange County	13	19	7,000
Patterson	17	21	6,639
Phoenix	16	31	--
Pittsburgh	10	17	5,740
Pittsfield	20	31	--
Portland	21	37	1,860
Portsmouth	25	40	1,000
Providence	25	40	4,000
Raleigh	13	22	1,900
Richmond (CA)	19	36	4,000
Richmond (VA)	30	60	1,912
Riverside	25	83	--
Roanoke	40	52	--
Rochester	19	40	2,000
St. Louis	23	45+	3,000
St. Paul	19	42	2,000
San Bernadino	17	15	1,000
San Francisco	20	40	1,500
Santa Ana	15	30	--
Santa Clara County	--	--	--
Savannah	22	52	2,360
Seattle	25	40	14,812
Shreveport	16	29	--
Spokane	--	--	--
Springfield (MA)	15	22	--
Springfield (MO)	25	33	--
Stockton	--	--	--
Syracuse	21	45	500
Toledo	22	31	4,000

Topeka	15	27	450
Trenton	19	27	1,435
Tulsa	4	30	3,000
Warren	16	21	300
Waterbury	38	56	2,000
Wichita	29	65	10,000
Wilmington	45	67	1,250
Winston-Salem	25	35	600
Worcester	12	17	8,700
Yonkers	23	40	--
Youngstown	60	80	3,000

Note: A number of figures were rounded to be integers. Where a range was given, the median (rounded in some cases to be an integer) is given. Many cities, e.g. Roanoke, indicated their figures were estimates.